R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 020 697 FL 000 622

THE IDEAL PREPARATION OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS.

BY- BROOKS, NELSON

NATIONAL FED. OF MODERN LANGUAGE TEACHERS ASSN.

PUB DATE FEB 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.40 8P.

DESCRIPTORS- *TEACHER EDUCATION, *LANGUAGE TEACHERS, *GRADUATE STUDY, *LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION, *EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES, SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING, CROSS CULTURAL TRAINING, INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS, CURRICULUM DESIGN, TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS, PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION, PROGRAM DESIGN, LINGUISTICS, CULTURE, CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY, PSYCHOLOGY, MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION,

LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION, AS DISTINGUISHED FROM LANGUAGE LEARNING, IS CONSIDERED IN THIS ARTICLE TO BE A NEW DISCIPLINE WHOSE OBJECTIVES ARE COMPETENCE IN THE TARGET LANGUAGE, CULTURAL AWARENESS, AND LITERARY ACQUAINTANCE. THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THIS DISCIPLINE IN TERMS OF A PROFESSIONAL GRADUATE PROGRAM FOR LANGUAGE INSTRUCTORS IS DISCUSSED. THE ARTICLE DEALS BRIEFLY WITH THE CRITERIA FOR THE SELECTION OF CANDIDATES, PREREQUISITES FOR ENTRANCE TO THE PROGRAM, A QUALIFYING EXAMINATION, A PERIOD OF INTERNSHIP, AND A CODE OF ETHICAL STANDARDS FOR LANGUAGE TEACHERS. PARTICULAR ATTENTION IS GIVEN TO THE CURRICULUM DESIGN OF THE PROGRAM, WHICH SHOULD INCLUDE COURSES IN PHILOSOPHY, PHILOLOGY, LITERATURE, PSYCHOLOGY, LINGUISTICS, AND CULTURAL ANTHROPOLOGY, AS WELL AS TRAINING IN DIDACTICS AND IN THE USE OF TECHNOLOGICAL AIDS. THIS SPEECH WAS DELIVERED AT THE CONFERENCE ON THE PREPARATION OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS (HARVARD UNIVERSITY, MAY 7, 1965) AND IS REPRINTED IN "THE MODERN LANGUAGE JOURNAL," VOLUME 50, NUMBER 2, FEBRUARY 1966, PAGES 71-78. (AR)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Reprinted from
THE MODERN LANGUAGE JOURNAL
Vol. L, No. 2, February, 1966

ED020697

*The Ideal Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers**

NELSON BROOKS, *Yale University*

FL000 622

IN THIS discussion I have, first of all, taken the word "ideal" as representing the best of its kind. I have taken it to mean what I am sure already exists somewhere and can reasonably be expected to exist anywhere. I have not tried to make it stand for supreme or absolute perfection. Secondly, I have used the term foreign language teacher to refer to anyone who teaches a language other than the learner's mother tongue. Although most of my comments bear directly on contemporary languages, including English, it will be found that, to a surprising extent, the same considerations apply to classical language as well. Thirdly, since preparation implies preparation for something, I have considered it a part of my assignment to be explicit about what it is our teachers are preparing for.

A great deal has happened to language teaching since the Second World War, and particularly during the last decade. Just what *is* our status in the academic world in the middle of the nineteen-sixties? Certainly our profession now presents many features that were not characteristic of us in the nineteen-thirties, and it is no thanks to the kind of teaching that was current and typical at that time that we are where we are today. We can no longer think of language teaching only as it was then, wedded to word lists, grammar analysis, and translations, with almost no use whatever of the target language as used by those who speak it natively. Today there is a greatly increased range of objectives and activities, an open-mindedness, a receptivity to leadership, a sense of importance and urgency, an awareness of public interest in and support for what we do—not to mention federal financial aid—and a satisfaction in accomplishment, all of which would have been hard to discover among those engaged in language teaching between the two World Wars.

Because of special national needs in the early 1940's, scholars in the field of descriptive linguistics were invited to come to the aid of language programs which, up to that time, had been planned and directed almost exclusively by scholars in the field of literature. As a result of the changes in the character of our programs since then, it is appropriate for us to ask, in all seriousness, what we are and where we are as of now. Are we to think of ourselves as the child of parents—literature and linguistics—who do not live together, although each claims custody of the offspring? Or are we like an unbranded maverick, a fair prize for the first comer who establishes a claim? Or are we to be compared to a vigorous adolescent who has left home to start out on his own, and is seeking a star to hitch his wagon to?

I believe that only the third of these choices is valid. And I believe that we shall not be in a position to outline an ideal preparation for foreign language teachers until we have drawn up at least a working model of a discipline under whose aegis this preparation is to take place. A discipline is something there are full professors of and Ph.D. programs in, and I have no less than this in mind in the proposals that follow. I recommend that we move to establish ourselves as an independent discipline with all possible academic speed—a rate of change that is not likely to bring on vertigo.

A New Discipline: Language Instruction

The air will be clearer if we state our objectives at once, and I see them as three: language competence, cultural insight and awareness, and literary acquaintance. The second of these is implied in the first—if we are to do more than recode the culture in which we live—and the third is also implied if our teaching is to take place in formal education in academic schools and colleges in the United States. Since we have not existed on our own up to now, we are in the fortunate position of being able to set ourselves up as an ideal discipline. For this, we could

* Delivered at the Conference on the Preparation of Foreign Language Teachers, conducted by the Massachusetts Advisory Committee on Foreign Languages at Harvard University, May 7, 1965.

hardly do better than to look closely at the three learned professions—law, medicine, and theology—to see if there cannot be extracted from them a pattern of organization appropriate to our need and intent. Naturally, I cannot aim at completeness in the time we have, nor can I preserve a true sense of proportions in the topics treated. While I shall stress certain matters that are new or in need of change, much that is of first importance will have to be taken for granted.

As I see it, there are six different headings or categories under which the elements necessary to establish our activity as a discipline may be grouped. These six categories are as follows:

a) criteria for the selection of candidates,
b) prerequisites for entrance to the program of preparation,
c) the curriculum content for the period of professonal concentration,
d) a qualifying examination for permission to practice,
e) internship,
f) a code of ethical standards that participants must adhere to.

I wish to propose some innovations, both ambitious and modest, and some changes, both major and minor, as well as the continuation of much that we now do that is of unquestioned value.

My first proposal concerns the name of our new discipline. Up to now we have spoken, both generally and specifically, of language learning. I propose that from now on we speak, instead, of language instruction. I was led to this proposal by the following statements of Professor Jerome Bruner, a professor of psychology at Harvard. "I think that any close observer of the educational scene would admit that there has been little direct influence of learning theory on the actual conduct of education. Learning theory, a descriptive discipline, has described how learning occurs in certain circumscribed situations that have been studied because they related to theoretical issues within the theory of learning. The theoretical issues in question have had little to do with the concerns of the educator. . . . The psychology of learning has only been tangentially concerned, until very recently, with the optimal means of *causing learning to occur*. Very little of learning theory is given over to optimum orders of encounter for the learning of materials. . . . The results of such research would provide a basis for a *theory of instruction* that is complementary to a *theory of learning*. There is every reason to believe that a theory of instruction would both broaden and enrich theories of learning. Not until we have developed a theory of instruction will we be able to test propositions about the best way to teach something. It is just such a theory that is required for 'proving' ideas about curriculum."[1]

It is manifest that learning and instruction when applied to language are by no means the same. Language learning forms a greater or a lesser part of what every human being does who is alive and awake. When we are very young, the learning of language is one of the most important activities we engage in, and it takes place with amazing efficiency whether anyone bothers to instruct us or not. When older, although the sounds and the grammar of the mother tongue have been thoroughly learned, we continue throughout our lives to acquire new words and new meanings for words already known. Language instruction implies language learning, but there is far more to formal instruction than the learning process itself. No matter how successful the psychologist may be as he observes and describes language learning in his laboratory, he will not get far in the area of language instruction without the collaboration of the language teacher. It is precisely the difference between the areas of language learning and language instruction that the teacher has information about and experience of and that the psychologist lacks. Our need is to know what language learning, both qualitative and quantitative, takes place in terms of the language instruction we prepare and present in our classes. The gist of Professor Bruner's comments is no more than what many a language teacher has thought, and indeed said, more than once in the past. The significant fact is that these views are now expressed by a psychologist and therefore must command an attention in his field that no mere language teacher could ever expect to receive.

Criteria for Selection

In setting up criteria for the selection of candidates, the following points should not be over-

[1] A. de Grazia and D. A. Sohn (editors), *Revolution in Teaching*, New York: Bantam Books, 1964, pp. 4–5.

looked: a good character, a fondness for children and adolescents and pleasure in working with them, and evidence of academic achievement that augurs well for success on two counts; one: the intellectual demands that must be met during the prolonged phase of preparation; two: the intellectual challenge of future classes that are sure to include many of the best students in the school or college in which the candidate will eventually teach. In addition, there should be discernible in the candidate something of the missionary's altruism and of the amateur actor's exuberance, for these are qualities he is sure to need in many of the critical and telling moments of his career.

Prerequisites

The prerequisites for the program of specialization in language instruction are an undergraduate major in an appropriate subject area, a recognized and measured degree of competence in the four language skills of the target language, and a period of residence in the target culture, either within the foreign country itself or an authentic cultural island. Though it may not always be possible to fulfill all of them before beginning the period of concentration, these prerequisites should nevertheless be recognized as such and should continue to be considered apart from a basic program of professional preparation.

Period of Concentration

The curriculum to be followed during the period of concentration is, of course, the very heart of the entire program of teacher preparation. It is essentially a graduate school program, although certain parts of it may well be included in the years that precede the bachelor's degree. In my view, it comprises *eight* different fields of study, six of them being neighboring disciplines that all deal with language, and two of them relating to the framework and background, the techniques and procedures that are necessary for professional practice.

It is clear that in the nexus of problems we must face there are certain focal points that demand serious and continued attention. What is to be the role of the mother tongue in instruction in the target language? What is the role of translation when learning to use a language as its native speakers use it—who obviously don't translate? How is the explanation of structure to be related to gaining control of the new structure? How is instruction in the audio-lingual areas of language to be related to instruction in reading and writing? How is measurement to be developed and used so that it can be a reinforcement to learning? What is the role of cultural and literary studies in language courses? How are we to relate language to communication, since there is far more to communication than language—and far more to language than communication? And, insistently and perpetually, what do we mean by meaning? It will be found that each of these problems requires frequent reference to several or all of the eight fields of study I have referred to and of which I shall speak in greater detail in a few moments.

Qualifying Examination

Fortunately, the unavoidable need for a qualifying examination has already in large part been met. Thanks to the foresight of our professional leaders and to the financial aid provided by the federal government, we now have, in the MLA Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students, batteries of tests in seven areas of competence. These have already begun to have a beneficial effect upon the programs of teacher preparation and upon the capableness of our teaching personnel. They will require only modest additions to match our new needs.

Internship

Supervised practical training is a categorical requirement for every properly prepared candidate for teaching. There is need for repeated observations of master teachers at work, and for initial periods of teaching under the surveillance of master teachers, as well as for the advantage of close supervision during the first year's teaching assignment.

Code of Ethics

The adjective 'ideal' in our title permits us to be fully high-minded, and we will do well to establish a code of ethics that the specialist in language instruction will be required to observe. As a case in point: the coaching of students for extra-mural tests often presents thorny problems about which the individual teacher would be relieved and grateful to have responsible professional opinion clearly stated.

Curriculum for Period of Concentration

However lengthy may be the time we feel it necessary to spend on matters that come under the headings of didactics and technology, the crux of the matter, the very nucleus around which our entire activity is centered lies in an appropriate grasp of what six major fields of study have to say about the nature of language and its history, the learning of it and its use. We may indeed provide our student teachers with long lists of what to do and how to do it, but unless these recommendations and techniques are supported by well-grounded justifications, I see no way of giving professional status to what we do, nor of providing prospective teachers with an acceptable rationale for the directives we impart.

Today, for the first time in history, language stands clearly revealed—in part—in the sharp and shadowless light of science. Especially is this true of the sounds of language and the ways in which they cluster and sequence themselves to form what we call words and intonation patterns. But also—in part—language continues to remain securely cloaked in secrecy. And this is especially true of the manner in which meaning attaches itself to, is borne by, then separates itself from what we call utterances and sentences. He who deals with language must be prepared to accept what science says about it and he should be grateful for the unsuspected truths about language which science has revealed. But he who would attempt to understand language in its entirety must be prepared to say farewell to science when he wishes to explore areas into which science is not as yet prepared to go. I believe that we must recognize as two cardinal principles of our new discipline that it cannot be related unilaterally to any single existing discipline but must associate with several, and that it cannot be related solely to either the sciences or the humanities but must establish its roots in both areas.

You may be sure that this mid-position which I am recommending will not, at least at first, be a comfortable one. We are sure to be misunderstood both on the right and on the left. We shall hear from the humanist that the teaching of living languages should not be debased, that the teaching of language must end up in the study of literature, that we are forming civilized and cultivated young people, not parrots. We shall hear from the scientists that their subjects of specialization are being trivialized, and there will be distant thunder about the dangers of assumption without adequate proof—a high-sounding sentiment that also looks fine in print, but which, as a principle to teach by, or even to live by, approaches the absurd. If we are to withhold action until all the proofs are in, who would ever vote for a political candidate, or indeed who would ever get married? The undergraduates I must face at nine: ten next Monday morning can't wait until I am armed with adequate proof for the rightness of everything I shall say or do. Some misunderstanding of our new position is to be expected, and in time it will dissolve. Meanwhile, I do not believe it is our assignment to try, as the story goes, either to humanize the scientist or to simonize the humanist—though if better mutual relations should result from a clearer understanding of what language is and how it is learned and taught and used, we should certainly rejoice.

Aspects of Language

An inventory of what we *do* know about language is lengthy, useful, and often surprising. A listing of what we do *not* know about language is even longer, is often sobering, and is certainly frustrating. Language has many aspects, varying from clockwork to poetry, and the numerous ways of viewing language merit sustained study by the person who is to make language instruction his life's work. Taken one by one, these different aspects lead us to the six disciplines to which I have referred.

Philosophy

I propose that we begin with philosophy, that sea of speculation from which the island of science continues slowly to emerge as it adds the hard cold facts of provable truth to its growing edge. Language is a system of symbols and can be fully understood only when considered as such, and in company with a number of other symbol systems which the human mind habitually employs, such as music and mathematics, myth, rite, and ritual. For the most part language is important not in itself but in what it stands for. Dealing with language is not the same as dealing with precious stones or lumber or fabric or fuel. These are valued for what they are in themselves. The value of the packets of

sound and the curved and dotted marks we call language lies not in the sounds and marks that we produce and interpret, but in what they represent. To understand language as a symbol system—one of many—to understand how language carries meaning and how we know what this meaning is, an inquiry closely connected with the ultimate question of how we know what we know—all these considerations lead us to philosophy.

Because of its ability to symbolize reality and to mediate between thought and overt action, language stands at the threshold of the real and the non-real. The relationship of language to communication, of analysis to analogy, of meaning in a word to meaning in a sentence—all these are constant everyday problems in language classrooms, and for the teacher in training they require and deserve an examination in the light of philosophy.

Philology

Language has a history, and a very long one. How it began and developed in its spoken form is impossible to reconstruct, but in its written form it has long been studied intently by specialists in the establishing of and interpretation and evaluation of texts as well as the formulation of grammar rules about its structure. If we wish our students to understand something of the history of language, especially in its written form, to understand how a given text is established and interpreted and evaluated, to know something of the many grammars that have attempted to describe how language works, to know something of the slow changes in both form and meaning that languages undergo, to understand the full story of the redaction of spoken language to written or printed form, from mere correctness to the complete understanding of a literary text and to the fine points of stylistics, then they are fully entitled to an acquaintance with the traditions and procedures and values of philology.

Literature

The importance of literary studies for our future teachers is too obvious to require more than brief reference in this review of indispensable areas of study. But it may be worth recalling that language, mundane and banal as it so often is in everyday use, possesses the remarkable capacity of being able to take on at times an esthetic quality and, in the hands of the poet and the writer, of being transformed into fine art. An experience with language in this transmuted form should not be denied either our teachers or their students. And, apart from literature as an end in itself, a judicious use of literary texts can add immeasurably to the success of language instruction at all levels.

Psychology

Again, language is something we do, all of us, and it is almost as natural to us as eating and sleeping and breathing. It permeates our inner lives as well as being an indispensable factor in our relationships with others. If we observe language from this point of view and say that it is behavior, then the science of human behavior, psychology, must have many things to say about this so characteristic mental and physical activity of all human beings. We are not born with language but we learn it, and memory, habit formation, innate ability, and motivation all play a part in the end result. When we relate learning to the instruction process, we become sharply aware of teacher-student interaction, and we realize that language, in its essence, is neither individual behavior nor group behavior, but *dyadic* behavior, and merits intense study in these terms. In addition, we need to know what progress is being made as a result of our instruction and therefore we need frequent recourse to measurement. For this too we must t urn to the psychologist, the specialist in mental measurement.

In making an appeal to psychology, however, we are entitled to be specific about the kind of psychologist we think is in a position to help us, for already a number of red herrings have been dragged across our path an have deflected us from a true understanding of language learning in the circumstances in which it is our obligation to see that learning happens. The psychologist whose help we seek is one who, first of all, has himself made substantial progress toward a coordinate bilingualism, and thereby understands what we who must man the controls in the classroom are talking about, one who is willing to recognize the profound importance of cognitive behavior in second language learning, who is willing to lock the door of his psychological laboratory and betake himself to the class-

room, with all its quivering and uncertain variables, and carry out as best he can his controlled experiments in terms of the teachers, the learners, and the conditions of learning that are to be found there, and who is at least as interested in what use the teacher can make of the results obtained as he is in developing the process whereby the experimentation is carried out.

Linguistics

Language is systematic, almost fantastically so, and requires that the user master its complications if he is to make it work for him at all. In order to obtain a scientific description of the systematic functioning of language, we turn to descriptive linguistics, for an understanding of language is sure to remain inadequate and distorted without reference to the principal findings of this discipline. Linguistics begins by separating code from meaning, and although it helps us little with the latter, its discoveries in regard to the sounds, the forms, and the syntax patterns of language have been and will continue to be of enormous help in language instruction.

Linguistics also separates spoken language from written language and has made us aware of many differences that had gone unrecognized and that are of prime importance in our work. One of the most valuable observations that the linguist has to make to the language teacher concerns a long list of popular misconceptions about what language really is. We tend to think that a language is its vocabulary—surely every newspaper or popular magazine article on the subject suggests this. We tend to think that the alphabet of a language represents the sounds of the language. We tend to think that the least common denominator of spoken speech is a word. We tend to think that the traditional list of the parts of speech reflects the way words go together to make up sentences. Now all of these things are true, in a rough and ready, Canada-is-north-of-the-United States kind of way, but each of these statements, when examined closely, turns out to be inaccurate, sometimes extravagantly so, and it is the linguist who has opened our eyes and our ears to many of the facts of language of which we were unaware or about which our knowledge was inaccurate. The specialist in language instruction can no longer be permitted to remain in ignorance of what is now to be known about the nature of his subject matter. There is no better remedy for this than a sustained exposure to the descriptive linguist's analysis of language and of a given language—with the insistent proviso that this be done with a view to the ultimate use the student teacher will make of the insights thus to be acquired.

What we may expect from the linguists is, I think, fairly well reflected in the outline of courses that will be offered at the Institute of Linguistics to be held this coming summer at the University of Michigan. It is, I suppose, no surprise that the word philosophy appears nowhere in the list of 57 courses, but to me it *is* surprising that the word philology likewise appears nowhere, although the words phonology, morphology, and syntax appear over and over again. Now, I am old enough to remember from whom the linguists got these terms, and although I am no believer in ancestor worship, it does seem that when we have inherited grandmother's jewelry and her bankbook and large sections of her landed estates, it is rather ungrateful to banish all reference to her forever. Of direct interest to us in this Linguistic Institute Program is the role assigned to language teaching. There are three courses in which this is referred to, one on the application of linguistics to the teaching of English as a second language, another on linguistics and the teaching of French, and a third on linguistics and the teaching of Spanish, although these last two appear to have been added as an afterthought.

One happy fact that must never be overlooked is that dozens of the best linguists that are to be found are also among our very best language teachers. These are the persons who, by changing hats, have been able to infuse language teaching with salient principles of linguistic analysis, and we are eternally grateful to them for it. Nevertheless, there is no blinking the fact that when linguists get together as linguists, little is said or thought about the problems of classroom instruction.

Cultural Anthropology

Finally, as we scrutinize language carefully to see exactly what it means, we are led directly to the culture in which the language is spoken natively, for only through our efforts to understand culture can we arrive at a knowledge of what a language means to those whose language

it is. This necessitates an excursion into the field of cultural anthropology. Every element of language corresponds to a segment of the totality of the thought and action and surroundings of those who speak it. It is this point-by-point relationship that gives it currency and value in the culture to which it belongs.

There are important distinctions to make as we trace the elements of language to the segments of culture to which they refer. We must first of all distinguish between culture and civilization, the latter being essentially connected with living in cities, while the former refers to the totality of thought and life. We must also distinguish between verbal and nonverbal culture, between the food we are offered and what we say as we accept it. And we must make a still further distinction for which I propose the terms *formal* culture and *deep* culture, meaning by *formal* culture the results of creative endeavor, the achievement of intellectual and artistic genius, and all the various modes of significant thought and genteel living of which a country is fully aware and justly proud, and is quite ready to talk about, to display, and even to export. By *deep* culture, in contrast, we refer to individual thoughts and actions, the beliefs and concerns and hopes and worries, the personal preferences and the personal possessions, the many and subtle gradations of interpersonal relationships as expressed in deeds and words, the day-by-day details of life as it is lived—often with little or no awareness—at home and at school, in church and in celebrations, in childhood and in manhood, in country and in city—in a word, what it is like to be a Japanese or a German or a Peruvian. The word culture has many different meanings, and we must learn to agree on which meaning is meant. But not to learn culture, both *formal* and *deep*, is not to learn meaning, and in language learning we would be left with the sounds and forms and syntax that referred to our own culture, or to the wrong thing, or to nothing at all.

Summary of Disciplines

Thus we have three areas of the humanities, philosophy, philology, and literature, and three areas of science, psychology, linguistics, and anthropology, with which our new discipline must establish channels for exchange of insights and information and with which our students must be brought into contact. In our excursion into these six disciplines, our interest is essentially in concepts rather than terminology, in studies and results that have a significant bearing upon classroom instruction rather than in an extensive review of all the basic principles of the discipline concerned. If this means that we must have courses in the field of X for the nonspecialist, let us have them. If some of the best specialists in the field of X cannot teach such courses, let us identify those who can. Findings that remain so esoteric that they can be understood only by the specialist are not among our primary concerns.

Dydactics

Dydactics may be divided into two principal sections, one comprising courses appropriate for any candidate preparing for a teaching career, such as the history of education, the philosophy of education, and educational psychology. The second section is concerned directly with instruction in foreign languages and all that relates to it, including objectives, course content, materials, classroom dynamics and techniques, tests and measurements, as well as matters that pertain to the professional growth and development of the teacher when he will be in service. Many details in this second section of dydactics need to be closely related to the internship phase of preparation.

In the training of the future teacher there should be a recognition of the needs he himself has as an advanced student of the subjects he is studying as well as of the needs he will have in dealing with his future students in the early phases of language study. The difference in these two kinds of needs and their important interrelationship should be fully respected.

Technology

Technology has become increasingly important to us in the past few years, especially as we have encountered it in the form of mechanisms for recording and reproducing the sounds of the human voice, and in experiments in teaching by means of television. On the whole, I should say that we have accommodated ourselves fairly successfully to the use of electro-mechanical devices in language instruction, and any language teacher preparing for a career in either school or college is in undoubted need of a first

hand experience with the installation and use of such devices as aids in instruction.

We may note with regret that in this category professional concerns often collide head on with the profit motive that animates the world of business. Conclusions as to the instructional worth of mechanisms cannot be drawn merely from data on volume of sales. As a case in point, the teaching of foreign languages to children by television may well have become a good investment financially, but its pedagogical value, if any, has not yet been demonstrated in any valid way. In the area of technology as it affects materials, much confusion has resulted from our own professional failure to distinguish between what contributes directly to language instruction and the uses to which language competence can be put after it has been learned. Pictures, for example, are peculiarly effective in cultural studies, but their contribution to the learning of phonology, morphology, and syntax is practically nil. The opposing tendencies of pictures to particularize and of language to generalize have so far not been accommodated to our needs, or even understood.

Immediate Steps

I am well aware that at first it will not be easy to find persons to prepare the programs or give the courses I am describing. But I have some suggestions as to how such programs may be outlined and the steps to be taken to identify those who can teach them. Since the year 1959, there have been held on the campuses of colleges and universities all over the country NDEA Institutes, now numbering in the hundreds. The participants in these Institutes have been teachers in service in the secondary and elementary schools. Each of these Institutes has had a director, chosen because he had an important position in the language and literature department of his institution and because of his willingness to tackle the problems of language instruction at the school level. I can think of no group of people in a better position to report on what language teachers know and need to know. If it were my assignment, I would appoint a commission of persons selected from this group (headed perhaps by Professor Lawrence Poston, the great white father of the NDEA Institute Program) whose task it would be to architect the program necessary for establishing the discipline of language instruction as such, and to identify those who, by talent and temperament and experience, are well qualified to assume an important role in our ideal program of teacher preparation. To this list of available university personnel I would add the names of those who act as supervisors of language programs in state departments of education and in school systems that support a vigorous and forward looking language program.

As we move into our new location and surroundings, we shall not all be happily settled and content at once. We shall continue to have with us those who are devoted to the Charlemagne approach to language learning—so named because of the spell it has cast over European language programs apparently ever since the Middle Ages. In the United States it led to the reading objective of some decades ago, whose prodigious unsuitability to our needs was proved about as definitively as anything could be. Yet it should not be thought that all our efforts in the past were without worth. The study of languages and literatures and cultures other than our own is a noble thing, no matter if the results were often much less than they might have been. Certainly we all wish to preserve the good features of traditional language programs, but we now wish to add to them a large measure of return that was not possible before, and that a new orientation and new techniques have demonstrated as being well within our grasp.

In conclusion, may I repeat a statement made at the beginning, that the ideal preparation of foreign language teachers presupposes a program and a staff equipped to make the desired result possible. We can hardly plan for the preparation of teachers without planning for the framework within which it can take place. For this reason it has been necessary to speak not only about the subject of our discussion but also about the creation of a new discipline within which it can be provided. Since the year 1952, and especially since the year 1958, we who teach foreign languages have been given a place in the sun. It is my sincere hope that we may establish this new discipline with the broadest professional support after intensive discussion and planning in order that we may merit and retain the enviable place we now have.